



Food insecurity among children can increase over the summer months when school meals are unavailable to most children. The Summer Food Service Program offers a key response to this challenge but requires children to go to congregate feeding sites and only serves about 16 percent of children receiving free and reduced price school lunches during the school year. USDA implemented a demonstration and conducted a rigorous evaluation of the Summer EBT for Children demonstrations which provide summer food benefits directly to the households of needy children. The Final, Comprehensive SEBTC Process and Impact Evaluation Report will combine findings from demonstrations conducted in the summers of 2011, 2012, and 2013. It rigorously evaluates the impact of the intervention on the food security of children during the summer when school meal programs are not available, while closely examining the processes and technologies that led to the relative success or failure of each demonstration project. As a result, objective reviewers will be needed to validate the following aspects of the Summer EBT Demonstrations for Children.

1. **Research methodology, experimental design and statistical analysis.** Reviewers will be requested to determine if (i) the research methodology employed and experimental design implemented were appropriate to establish a causal relationship, should it exist, between the interventions and a change in the food security levels of school age children; and (ii) whether the analyses, as carried out, objectively and accurately reflect the strength of the potential causal relationships
2. **Knowledge of nutritional needs of school age children.** Reviewers will be charged with assessing the face validity of the intervention, e.g. is it likely that the level of increased household purchasing power associated with the intervention could lead to improvements in child food security and, if so, what the long-term developmental benefits might be. Reviewers will be asked to judge if long-term developmental benefits are likely to vary depending on the delivery model employed, i.e. SNAP or WIC.
3. **Familiarity with FNS child nutrition programs, particularly the National School Lunch Program and the Summer Food Service Program.** Reviewers will be asked to determine if the SEBTC program would operate in a fashion complimentary or redundant with other FNS summer feeding programs. Reviewers will also be asked to determine if the institution of the SEBTC will impact the processes associated with the efficient administration of other FNS child nutrition programs and how processes can be streamlined. The efficient, non-invasive use of National School Lunch Program data to determine SEBTC eligibility will also be explored.
4. **Familiarities with electronic benefits/funds transfer technologies.** Reviewers will be requested to opine on the relative merits of existing and near-future electronic benefits transfer (EBT) technologies for the distribution of SEBTC benefits. EBT and electronic funds transfer technologies are rapidly evolving with data transfers becoming progressively more portable, faster, and with greater detail. Therefore, reviewers must possess a depth of knowledge that goes beyond existing SNAP, and even WIC, data transfer processes.

All peer reviewers will be informed that the Agency does not have funds to make changes that require additional data collection, reconsideration of the research design, or significant modifications to data collection and analysis methods. The reviewers will be informed that the Agency, while it will welcome recommendations that may improve the design of any future studies, requires an evaluation of the current product that is cognizant of the funding constraints.

Each reviewer will be instructed to supply the results of their review in written form. Because the SEBTC study is considered influential scientific information, reviewers will be informed that the Agency is required to make available to the public the written charge to the peer reviewers, the peer reviewers' names and reports, and the agency's response to their comments.